

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 22, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action.

Claims 16, 40, 42, 44-45 are amended to correct informalities, claims 41 and 52 are cancelled and new claims 53 and 54 are added. No new matter is added. Claims 1-40, and 43-53 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action objected to claim 16 because of informalities. Claim 16 is amended to depend from claim 15.

The Office Action further objected to claims 44 and 45 because these claims are network system claims that dependent from network element claims. Claims 44 and 45 are amended to reflect that they depend from network element claims.

The Office Action further stated that claim 44 is missing. Applicants note that while claim 44 was not missing, claim 41 was missing. Accordingly, claim 41 is listed as cancelled.

The Office Action stated that there are two claims identified as 52. Accordingly, the second claim 52 is cancelled and new claim 53 is added to recite the features of the cancelled claim 52. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-40 and 42-52 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the publication “Network Working Group” by Handley et al. (Handely). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-14 depend recites a method of performing authentication of a subscriber during a subscriber equipment terminated call. The method includes the steps of sending a session invitation message (S4, S5) to the subscriber equipment, the session invitation message including authentication information (AuthData1), and performing an authentication procedure in the subscriber equipment by using the authentication information.

Claim 15, from which claims 16-28 depend, recites a network system comprising a subscriber equipment and at least one network control element, wherein, during a subscriber equipment terminated call, the network control element is adapted to send a session invitation message to the subscriber equipment, the session invitation message including authentication information (AuthData1), and the subscriber equipment is adapted to perform an authentication procedure by using the authentication information.

Claim 29, from which claims 30-40 and 42-44 depend, recites a network control element, wherein, during a subscriber equipment terminated call, the network control element is adapted to send a session invitation message to the subscriber equipment, the session invitation message including authentication information.

Claim 46, from which claims 47- 51, 53 and 54 depend, recites a subscriber equipment which is adapted to be connected to a network, and, during a subscriber

equipment terminated call, to receive a session invitation message from the network, the session invitation message including authentication information, and to perform an authentication procedure by using the authentication information.

Handely relates to session initiation protocol (SIP). Handley disclose that SIP invitations used to create sessions carry session descriptions which allow participants to agree on a set of compatible media types. SIP supports user mobility by proxying and redirecting requests to the user's current location.

Applicants submit that Handley fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in any of pending claims. Specifically, Handely fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of sending a session invitation message to the subscriber equipment, the session invitation message including authentication information, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 15, 29 and 46.

Handley merely mentions an authentication procedure during SIP and not sending the authentication in the session invitation message.

Applicants submit that since claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-40, 42-44, and 47-51 depend from claims 1, 15, 29 and 46 respectively, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1, 15, 29 and 46.

Based at least on the above, Applicants submit that Handley fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1-40 and 42-50. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to claim 41 and stated that claim 41 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. However, upon review of the application file and PAIR, Applicants note that claim 41, inadvertently, was never entered and/or pending in this application. Therefore, Applicants request that the pending claim for which allowable subject matter was indicated, be identified for clarification of this issue.

Applicants submit that the pending claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed or suggested in the cited prior art. Therefore, Applicants request that each of the pending claims be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

33,125
for

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jf

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time